DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 339 SP 033 230

AUTHOR Chen, Michael
TITLE Between Teaching and Administration: The Dual Loyalty of Aspiring Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Qualifications; Administrators; *Administrator Selection; Collegiality; Foreign Countries; *Leadership; *Occupational Aspiration; *Principals; *Role Conflict; Secondary Education; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS Israel; *Leader Selection

ABSTRACT

This study examined orientations and attitudes of mid-career teachers faced with the decision of remaining in the classroom only or accepting additional administrative responsibilities and positions. Those who aspire to leadership positions must demonstrate both loyalty to the principal and collegiality with the teachers, thereby placing themselves in a state of role conflict. An anonymous 47-item questionnaire was administered to all of the secondary school teachers in a medium-sized industrial city in the center of Israel. A total of 415 teachers responded. The teachers were classified into three groups: (1) those reporting no interest in leadership positions (N=157); (2) those aspiring to leadership positions (N=147); and (3) those with administrative positions (N=111). The variables measured were professional level, job satisfaction, and official educational attitudes. The findings confirmed the hypothesis that aspiring teachers possess a dual set of orientations and attitudes. They have more extreme opinions than either regular teachers or administrators. The high proportion of teachers aspiring to leadership positions indicates that governance and educational policy positions are on the agenda of many. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED385339

BETWEEN TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATION:

THE DUAL LOYALTY OF ASPIRING TEACHERS

by

Michael Chen

Tel Aviv University

and the

University of Pittsburgh

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Chen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Chicago, IL, April, 1991.

SP 033 230

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BETWEEN TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATION: THE DUAL LOYALTY OF ASPIRING TEACHERS

by

Michael Chen*

Tel Aviv University

and the

University of Pittsburgh

Introduction

Practically all school administrators are recruited from the teaching ranks in a long process of experiencing intermediate administrative roles. The purpose of this process is to facilitate move of teachers from a classroom decision-maker to an organizational leader (Bacharach & Conley, 1989).

At their mid career, many teachers are faced with a decision - to remain in the classroom only, or to accept additional administrative responsibilities and positions. Those who aspire to leadership positions are exposed to conflicting pressures. They are part of the teaching body and, simultaneously, take on leadership initiatives to rise above their collegial group (Lortie, 1975). Consequently, they are placed under cross pressures, which require dual loyalty. Principals tend to select teachers who are both loyal and capable, respected by the faculty (Barnet, 1984). As prospective administrators, aspiring teachers are in a state of role conflict as they have to demonstrate both loyalty to the principal and collegiality with the teachers (Corwin, 1970).

Although, appointments of teachers to leadership positions by the school principal is now very prevalent, and is even desired by many regular teachers, it reinforces role ambiguity and complicates work relationships in the school

---

*The author thanks Audrey Addi for her advice and assistance.

setting. Such appointments revolutionize traditional division of labor and alter the structure of authority and rewards. Overlapping and contradicting job ladders and definitions, ambiguous pay hierarchies, differential prescriptions of duties and payments associated with different combinations of teaching and administrative assignments are introduced into the school. Traditional collegiality among teachers, which is based on "unified salary schedules," which, so far, are used to provide increments only for seniority and for increasing levels of training and proficiency, are infringed upon (Bacharach & Shed, 1989). The mix of teaching and administrative roles distorts the nature of teaching as a single profession which is essentially homogeneous in its role definitions, demands and expectations (Conley, 1990).

The movement from teaching into full time or part time administrative positions seems to be worthwhile to many teachers from several points of view. School administration is perceived by the public at large as higher in social status then just teaching. It enjoys a higher level of authority in the line of command and in the formal organizational structure of the school and it accrues higher compensation. But it also estranges the teacher-leader from former colleagues.

The incongruence between the traditional full-time teacher role and the newly combined teacher-administrative function puzzles not only teachers' unions, which view it with mixed feelings (Cooper, 1990) but also is objected to by the US Supreme Court who ruled in the "Yeshiva Decision," that teachers who make decisions and recommendations concerning the hiring, promotions and removal of other faculty members, are managers and, consequently, cannot retain the rights of regular, full time teaches (Russo, 1990).

Furthermore, many regular teachers frequently distrust teacher leaders

who participate in the administrative process, because they view it as a disguised from of control. While superintendents and principals continue to make all the important decisions, teacher-leaders are left with the trivial ones.

It may also be the case that a problematic, hierarchical distance has been established between regular teachers and the new administrative core which is occupied by teacher administrators, teacher-supervisors, teacher masters, mentors, etc.

It is not surprising that this new organizational culture of schools, in which many teachers fulfill various hierarchical, curricular and administrative roles, hovers many tensions and ambiguities (Blase, 1989). This tension is most likely detected among teachers, who aspire to leadership positions, and "stand in line for their turn at a leadership position and automatic rewards on salary schedules . . ." (Hart & Murphy, 1990, p. 246).

The growing tensions between regular teachers, teacher leaders and full time administrators puts the highly stratified and diversified faculty in a new state of affairs. Bacharach et al. (1990) report that there is lack of consensus among teachers and administrators about the conceptualization and operationalization of the construct of shared decision making by teachers and administrators. Frequently, role conflict and role ambiguity follow the introduction of these new processes of operational and strategic decision making.

It seems that teachers, who are most vulnerable to such role conflicts and stresses, are those who stand in line for administrative appointments, and aspire for teacher-leadership positions. As regular teachers they are expected to entertain collegiality with other teachers. As aspirants of an

administrative positions, they have to identify with the school administration and with the organizational orientations and educational attitudes which are maintained by the school leadership. They must demonstrate loyalty to and cooperate with the school leaders.

The tensions and ambiguities of prospective teacher-leaders are intensified by the absence of any formal definition of the transition from teaching to administration and a lack of any acceptable procedures of socialization, training, promotion and appointment of regular teachers into authority positions. Hart and Murphy (1990) insist that "little attention to date has been paid to the critical need to change sociali-zation structures and processes for teachers who expect to function in leadership roles. While studies point to the importance of sociali-zation in all work settings and in redesigned teacher work . . . most restructuring and redesign plans include no provisions for . . . this radical work-change process." (p. 245)

It is highly probable that aspiring teachers will find themselves in a state of ambiguity and tension which is reinforced by the arbitrariness of the selection and appointment processes. These processes are determined idiosyncratically by each scool principal, who usually looks for personal loyalty before making a decision about promotion. (Barnet, 1984)

Loyalty is a diffuse popular concept which addresses itself to the extent that leaders could rely on their followers in implementing the policy and the performance of their tasks. In the school-site it indicates how much do the teachers accept the leadership of the school principal, and how much they are ready to invest efforts, talent and good will in school management and improvement. Loyalty is mainly a verbal behavior. It is reflected in a declared acceptance of the administration and the principal rule, it suggests

satisfaction with the job, cooperation with the principal and a sense of affiliation with school workers. Loyalty implies a complex and reciprocal set of relationships between the principal and the teachers. Generally speaking the principal is expected to reward the teachers for their loyalty. However, since is assumes mutual affective orientations between the teachers and the principal, it demands an intensive exchange of diverse resources and incentives between the parties (Johnston and Venable, 1986).

Teachers loyalty can be promoted in several ways. It is now generally accepted that positive, frequent and explanatory communication, initiated by the principal, reinforces teachers' acceptance of the administrative rule. Of greater importance for the enhancement of loyalty is the recruitment of teachers to take part in processes of decision making. Thus, the principal not only reduces the administrative burden and expand the boundaries of the school organization but also encourages many faculty members to share with him the responsibility of school management and improvement.

Recent studies indicate, however, that intangible incentives are not enough to ascertain loyalty and persuade teacher to take greater part in school improvement. Chapman and Boyd (1986) report that the effectiveness of intangible rewards in motivating teachers to invest time and energy in the implementation of school reforms is very limited. Teachers loyalty deteriorates dramatically when they are required to prolong their daily stay in the school and to be engaged in "paper work." Furthermore, verbal and intangible incentives, which are associated with professional collegiality and group cohesiveness directs teachers away from the "bureaucratic maze" into the traditionally closed classroom.

Teachers who aspire to leadership positions and wish to have part time

administrative positions are subjected to strong pressures resulting from their professional collegiality with their peers and their assumed loyalty to the principal.

The role conflict of teachers aspiring to leadership position is intensified by their efforts to convince the school principal that they possess the two qualities. First, they have to show that they are loyal to the present school management, and to the principal in particular, and agree with their policies, educational attitudes and work orientations. Second, they have to prove to the school management that they are respected by the faculty of the school and that their appointment to leadership positions will be understood and accepted by their colleagues.

A possible resolution of such a complicated situation can be achieved by adopting a bifurcated tendency to over identify the opposing reference groups of the aspiring teachers: the regular, professional, full time teacher on the one hand and the principal on the other hand. By over identification with other teachers in issues that are important and relevant to teachers, like difficulties in instruction or job satisfaction, aspiring leaders could obtain the support and recognition of their colleagues. By over exaggerated acceptance of the goals and educational attitudes of the principal and his/her partners, they could gain the approval and preference of the opposite group.

The strategy of dual loyalty could provide the aspiring teacher with the self-identity during the doubtful period of self-declared candidacy, before being appointed to an administrative role. Demonstrating over identification with the administration in some issues, such as school policy, can help the aspiring teacher present himself publicly as an aspirant for an administrative role. In the regular school culture, where administrative authority is

legitimized by professional standards and occupational solidarity, and where practically all administrators are former teachers, a strong attachment to teaching and colleagues is an inevitable asset to the prospective leader (Little, 1982). Indeed, considering the bitter resentment expressed by many regular teachers towards actual and prospective administrators, approval and support by teachers-colleagues could be the most important consideration in promotion (Barnet, 1984).

The expression of opposite and extreme points of views by declared candidates for succession of leadership positions tend to destabilize the organization. Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) report that qualified but unchosen candidates tend to either leave the organization or to function as bitter and frustrated opponents. Educational organizations are susceptible to such conflict situations and try to reduce them either by removing the challengers or by coopting them into the school administration.

Considering the ambiguous and stressful situation of teachers who presented their willingness to accept partial administrative responsibility, and their need to be approved by two opposing agencies, it is generally hypothesized that aspiring teachers will hold a bifurcated set of extreme orientations and attitudes. In some issues they will be more extreme than their colleagues and in some others more extreme than the administration.

It is hypothesized that aspiring teachers will express more critical and negative work orientations than regular classroom teachers and will conform with official school policies more than the school administration.

Methodology

An anonymous questionnaire was administered to all of the secondary school teachers in a medium-sized industrial city in the center of Israel.

A total of 415 teachers responded (response rate 47%). The questionnaire included 47 items. The respondents were asked to agree or disagree on a seven level scale to each item. The teachers were classified into three groups: 1) teachers who reported no interest in leadership positions (N = 157; 38%); 2) teachers who aspire to leadership positions (N = 147; 35%); and 3) teachers with administrative positions (N = 111; 27%), such as department chairs.

Three sets of variables were measured. The first set measured the professional level of the respondents. Professional level was measured by academic degree and seniority. The second set of variables is work orientations. This set of variables includes job satisfaction, (4 items e.g., If I had to start again, I would chose to be a teacher, α = .70), staff-administration cooperation: (10 items, e.g., administration and teachers agree about school discipline policies, α = .88), sense of affiliation, (4 items, e.g., the teachers feel that the school is a home, α = .70), willingness to adopt innovations; (4 items, e.g., In my subject matter there are many opportunities for creativity and innovation, α = .53), and perceived instructional difficulties; (15 items, e.g., the extra diversity in learning abilities in my classroom makes instruction very difficult, α = .81).

The third set of variables measures official educational attitudes. The scales measured attitudes toward: 1) school ethnic integration (3 items, e.g., The main purpose of schooling is school integration, α = .62); 2) Organization of instruction (3 items, e.g., Ability grouping helps both good and poor students α = .63); 3) policies for teaching underprivileged students, (2 items, e.g., High risk students should study in very small groups, α = .58).

Differences between the three groups of teachers on all variables were examined first of all by one way analysis of variance and subsequently by

discriminant analysis. Discriminant analysis was conducted to test whether the three sets of variables significantly distinguish between the group of teachers, and to estimate the distances of the groups centroids of aspiring teachers from regular classroom teachers and from teacher administrators.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

A general description and sample, as presented in Table 1 indicates that the secondary school teachers in 14 high schools in a middle sized industrial city constitute a very heterogeneous group. The average professional academic degree is comparable to 5 years of study: a B.A. or a B.Sc. degree and a teaching certificate. The average seniority is about 14 years, but it has high variability (S.D. = 8.73).

Teachers report in three out of the five scales, that measure actual work orientations, positive orientations toward their work. An average higher then five in a scale of seven. They also report low levels of difficulties in instruction (X = 2.71), positive collaboration with the administrative staff (X = 5.41), and high identification with the school and the profession (X = 5.21). A exception to positive orientations toward work is the significantly low level of job satisfaction (X = 4.13).

Results

Table 2 presents the differences among the members of the three groups: 1) administrators and teachers-administrators; 2) aspiring teachers; and 3) teachers who are fully satisfied to be teachers. The

INSERT TABLE TWO ABOUT HERE

results of Table 2 indicate that aspiring teachers have both the lowest level of academic training and have less seniority than regular and administrative teachers. In regard to work orientations, only two of the five

indicators significantly differentiate among the three groups of teachers in a univariate analysis of variance. Specifically, aspiring teachers report less cooperation between teachers and administrators in the school than do teachers and administrative-teachers. In addition, aspiring teachers tend to complain more than either administrative teachers or regular teachers that the present conditions of schools create severe instructional difficulties. In both cases aspiring teachers are more critical than their colleagues. There is no obvious consistency in the ranking of aspiring teachers, compared to the other groups, in regard to official educational attitudes. They rank lowest in respect to the role of the school in ethnic integration but are in the middle in regard to the other two attitude scales.

Table 3 summarizes the findings of the discriminant analysis, which explored the overall differences among the three groups, as they are measured by the distances among the centroids.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The analysis produced two significant functions. The first function, which corresponds to a Wilks Lambda of .764 and explains 23% of the variance, discriminates amongst all three groups along the professional background, work orientation and educational attitudes variables. High professional background, positive work orientations and low scores on educational attitudes characterize the teacher-administrators. Aspiring teachers are placed on the other extreme of these constructs, close to regular teachers. The group centroids indicates that aspiring teachers are the furtherest away from the teacher-administrators. As hypothesized, aspiring teachers are more extreme in their overall professional background, orientations and attitudes than regular teachers and are also very different from the group they want to join, namely administrators.

The second significant function (Wilks Lambda = .955) explains the residual variance of the educational attitudes and the work orientation. However, in this function aspiring teachers are placed on one extreme of the continuum near teacher-administrators, while regular classroom teachers are placed on the other extreme.

The discriminant analysis, which takes into consideration all the relationships among all the research variables simultaneously, provides findings which differ somewhat from the simplified, univariate analysis. While the univariate analysis indicated a nonsystematic placement of aspiring teachers, relative to the other two groups, the discriminant analysis indicates that on both functions they are ranked in one of the extremes. In the first function which has high loading on professional background and work orientations they are somewhat more extreme than classroom teachers. The distance in the respective group centroids is from .818 to -.348. In the second function they differed from other teachers' educational attitudes. The gap between the centroids, is from .262 to -.236.

The findings confirm the hypothesis that aspiring teachers possess a bifurcated set of orientations and attitudes. In part they resemble teachers, and in part, the administration. Furthermore, in both cases they have more extreme opinions than either the teachers and the administration.

Discussion

The research findings indicate, first of all, that a very high percentage of the teachers (27%) fulfill a part time administrative function in addition to classroom instruction. In addition, more than a third of the teachers (35%) is interested in getting part time administrative responsibility. The findings confirm Coopers' claim that a new organization

paradigm is in the making in the school-site. Indeed, "Teachers' rank and file are exposed to the enticements of shared decision-making by principals, department chairs, assistant principals, who wish to shape the culture of the particular school" (Cooper, 1990, p. 7).

Recent reforms, which endeavor to redesign teachers work and provided them with more control over their learning environment changed their position in the authority structure of the school. Studies of the professional development of prospective school administrators indicate their growing need for empowerment. It is suggested that as classroom teachers change from "paper pushers to individual free agents" (Conley, 1990) and participate in the management of the complex organization of the schools they change their position in the authority structure of the school.

Two main strategies, which aim at reinforcing teacher motivation to contribute to school improvement and to enhance their loyalty to the school principal, have been recently introduced into the school setting. The first one is the redesign of the teachers instructional activity. This strategy enable the principle to compensates teachers for improving their instruction by offering them better incentives, elevating their professional status and granting formal recognition to excellent work. It reinforces their professional competence, their authority over pupils and their control of the classroom. However, it removes them from the process of administrative decision-making, from authority over adults and from contact with external agencies which affect their work conditions.

The other strategy employed by school principles is to garner loyal teachers to school commitment by appointing them to part-time administrative positions. Such a strategy encourages teachers to take more responsibility

for the implementation of the programs, to cooperate with the school administration, and consequently may lead them to be more satisfied and efficient in their jobs.

As the findings show, the strategy of inducing teachers into part time positions is very acceptable. The high proportion of part time administrators and of teachers who aspire for such positions indicate that educational policy and school governance are constantly on the agenda of the teachers, and many teachers compete with one another to be official partners in the processes of decision making and policy implementation. The interest in combining the traditional children oriented, teacher role with the adult oriented administrative function, is often opposed reduced by the complexity of the job, or by the public reservation, as indicated by the Supreme Court decision in the Yeshiva Case (Russo, 1990). Nevertheless, the group of teachers who sustain the tensions between the polars of teaching and management more the other are the those who aspire to part time administrative positions.

The findings also indicates that the role stress of the aspiring teachers bifurcates their set of educational attitudes and orientation into two differentiated parts. The discriminant analysis show that in regard to work orientation, aspiring teachers differ mainly from administrators and are more extreme than regular teachers while in their attitudes to educational goals and policies they differ very much from teachers and are somewhat more extreme than administrators.

By being more critical of the conditions of teaching and by having more negative work orientations then classroom teachers, aspiring teachers demonstrate their understanding of, and sympathy with, the professional difficulties of their colleagues. Such publicized negative attitudes grant

them the necessary respect and support of the regular teachers and give them the right to represent the teachers.

Aspiring teachers also report positive attitudes towards educational policy and school organization which resemble those of the school administration. Through these orientations, aspiring teachers indicate their loyalty to with the school administration.

The findings indicate that moving from being a classroom teacher to a leadership position involves a complex process of attitude modification towards the world of work and educational policy. A complex view of the present state of the school emerges. It is evident that empowered and resourceful school principals exchange administrative authority for dedication to work and loyalty. It seem , however, that the staff of today schools' already includes too many chiefs, a large number of aspirants to chiefdom and not enough regular and dedicated teachers who are fully devoted to their students and their classroom.

The newly complex, stratified and stressful division of labor and authority, which seems to characterize schools, probably creates a very tense and diversified organization to coordinate and manage. It is also very plausible that the present day school which aspires to enrich its highly diversified body of students with essential, social, emotional and intellectual attainments, cannot be anything else, but a very stressful and complex organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacarach, S.B.; Bamberger, P.; Conley, S.C.; & Bauer, S. (1990). The dimensionality of decision participation in educational organization: The value of a multi-domain evaluative approach. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(2), pp. 126-167.

Bacarach, S.B.,& Conley, S.C. (1989). Uncertainty and decsision making in teaching: Implications for managing line professionals. In T.J. Sergiovanni, & J.H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bacarach, S.B., & Shedd, J.B. (1989). Power and empowerment: The constraining myths and emerging structures of teacher unionism in an age of reform. In J. Hannaway, & R. Crowson, The politics of reforming school administration. New York: The Falmer Press.

Barnet, B.J. (1984). Subordinate teacher power in school organizations. Sociology of Education, 57(1), pp. 43-55.

Blase, J.J. (1989). Teachers political orientations vis-a-vis the principal: The micropolitics of the school. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson, The politics of reforming school administration. New York: The Falmer Press.

Chapman, J., & Boyd, W.L. (1986). Decentralization, devolution and the school principal. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 12(1).

Conely, S.C. (1990). A metaphor for teaching: Beyond the bureaucratic professional dichotomy. In S.B. Bacharach (Ed.), Education reform. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cooper, B.S. (1990). Unions, central management and school site control: Is a new organization paradigm in the making? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.

Corwin, R.G. (1970). Militant professionalism: A study of conflict in high schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Firestone, W.A. (1977). Participation and influence in the planning of educational change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 13(2), pp. 163-183.

Hart, A.V., & Murphy, M.J. (1990). New teachers react to redesign teachers work. American Journal of Education, 98(3), pp. 224-250.

Johnston, G.S., & Venable, B.P. (1986). A study of teacher loyalty to the principal: Rule administration and hierarchical influence of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(4), pp. 4-27.

Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), pp. 325-334.

Miskel, C., & Cosgrove, D. (1985). Leaders succession in school setting. Review of Educational Research, 55(1), pp. 87-105.

Russo, C.J. (1990). "Yeshiva" and public education: A tempest in a teapot. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration.

Table 1. Means and Standard Devaiations of the Variables (N = 415).

Variables and Scales	Means	S.D.
Professional Level		
Professional-Academic Degree		
Uncertified Teacher (1) Certified MA Degree (6)	4.05	1.40
Seniority (No. of Years)	13.81	8.73
Work Orientations Scales		
Job satisfaction	4.13	1.54
Staff-Administrator cooperation	5.41	1.15
Sense of Affiliation	5.24	1.04
Willingness to innovate	5.07	1.09
Instructional difficulties	2.71	.87
Educational Attitudes Towards:		
School integration	4.30	1.56
Organiztaion of instruction	5.73	1.24
Policies towards disadvantaged students	4.58	1.01

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviation and f-values of the Three Reseach Groups

Results of One Way Analysis of Variance							
	Regular Teachers		Aspiring Teachers		Teachers Administrators		f values
	(N=157) X	S.D	(N=147) X	S.D	(N=111) X	S.D	
Professional Level							
Academic Degree	3.95	1.39	3.80	1.46	4.51	1.24	8.86*
Seniority	13.95	8.35	11.14	8.18	17.85	8.50	21.26*
Work Orientations							
Job Satisfaction	4.18	1.47	3.95	1.51	4.28	1.64	1.57
Cooperation	5.44	1.09	5.21	1.27	5.66	1.01	4.88*
Affiliation	5.30	1.06	5.17	1.03	5.31	1.01	.84
Innovation Adoption	5.11	1.13	5.03	1.11	5.21	1.03	.88
Instructional Difficulties	2.58	.80	2.83	.91	2.73	.89	3.15*
Educational Attitudes							
School Integration	4.43	1.54	4.15	1.51	4.31	1.68	1.69
Organization of Instr.	5.96	1.08	5.76	1.26	5.36	1.35	7.94*
Disadvantaged Students	4.87	1.89	4.56	1.03	4.24	1.07	13.15*

Table 3. Discriminant Analysis of the Work Orientations and Attitudes Toward Official Educational Policies of Three Groups

Variables	Standardized Discriminant Coefficients	
	Function 1	Function 2
Professional Level		
Academic Degree	.403	.246
Seniority	.643	.386
Work Orientations		
Job Satisfaction	N.S.	N.S.
Cooperation	.407	.074
Affilitation	N.S.	N.S.
Innovation Adoption	N.S.	N.S.
Instructional Difficulties	.305	-.474
Educational Attitudes		
School Integration	N.S.	N.S.
Organization of Instruction	-.153	.394
Disadvantaged Students	-.424	.527
Wilks Lambda	.764	.955
Sig.	.000	.010
Group Centroids		
Teachers	-.230	.262
Aspiring Teachers	-.348	-.236
Teachers Administrators	.818	-.037